

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 13, 2005. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16 and 18-23 were pending in this Application. Claims 4, 11 and 17 were previously cancelled by Applicants without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16 and 18-23 were rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 14-16, and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,466,989 issued to Hslao-Wei Chu (hereafter "Chu") in view of U.S. Patent 6,490,297 issued to Mark H. Kraml et al. ("Kraml et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combination, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious. In order to make obvious Applicant's claimed invention, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

The Chu reference is directed to a network connection device for automatic wiring. See Col. 2, Lines 16-25. Chu teaches using a network cable with multiple lines therein to connect different components. See Figs. 1 & 2 and Col. 3, Lines 58-61. Chu further teaches an interface circuit 214 and a switching array 216 that determines the proper connectivity of the multiple wires within network cable 230. Col. 4, Lines 52-67.

Examiner cites to Chu as teaching, among other elements, "generating a signal on the 1st computing component indicative of the cabling connection to be made. (Emphasis added). Applicants submit that the connectivity method and system of Chu occurs only after a network cable 230 is installed and provides no teaching with respect to generating cabling connections to be made. Instead, Applicants submit that Chu provide teaching only with respect to system in which cabling operations are already complete.

Examiner cites to Kraml as teaching repeating the steps of determining cabling connections for additional computing components. However, Kaml is directed to "a system and method for identifying one or more signaling channels during communication between a

controller and a remote system component." Col. 1, Lines 7-11. The method of Kraml proceeds only after signaling channels of the communication link have been located. See FIG. 2 and Col. 5, Lines 22-28. Accordingly, like Chu, Kraml fails to provide any teaching with respect to determining cabling connections to be made and presupposes that the components in question (in the case of Kraml - system controller 12 and system component 16) are already cabled.

Each of Independent Claims 1, 10 and 16 recite limitations for determining a "cabling connection to be made between the first computing component and" a second computing component. For the reasons discussed above, Chu and Kraml fail to disclose, teach or suggest determining cabling connections to be more and therefore, either alone or in combination, cannot render obvious Independent Claims 1, 10 or 16 or Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 12, 14 or 20-23.

Claims 5, 13, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu and Kraml et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,761,294 issued to Shmuel Shaffer et al. (hereafter "Shaffer"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combination, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

Applicants submit that Claims 5, 13, 18 and 19 depend from Claims that have been planned in condition for allowance, obviates the present rejection. Additionally, Applicants submit that the Chu, Kraml, and Shaffer, either alone or in combination fails to teach each and every limitation of Claims 5, 13, 18 and 19.

Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under §103(a) and full allowance of Claims 5, 13, 18 and 19.


CONCLUSION

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 13, 2005. Applicants appreciate the Office's careful review of the application. Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all remaining claims.

Applicants believe there are no additional fees due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2545.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Brian E. Szymczak
Reg. No. 47,120

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Baker Botts L.L.P.

CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **23640**

512.322.2545

512.322.8319 (fax)

Date: 3/22/05